Vol. X, No. 6 HUMAN EVENTS February 11, 1953

A JOB FOR CONGRESS

By FRANK CHODOROV

THOUGH WE ARE NOT agreed on what sin is, we are all against it. That is, we are against it when it is committed; in the abstract it does not bother us in the least. It is the sinner, not the sin, that we are against. In the same way, we cannot get excited about economic or political principles until they are violated, and then our ire is directed against the persons who did the violating. Principles have meaning only when wrapped in practices and bound with personalities.

All this serves to underline the problem now facing American conservatives. For twenty long years they attacked the New Deal and its successor, the Fair Deal; who else was there to attack? Inevitably, the conservatives became identified with the GOP, which now at long last sits in the saddle of power. This is not quite a fair association of labels, for many Jeffersonian Democrats have consistently fought the same socialistic policies and the Democratic politicians who put those policies into effect. Nevertheless, conservative Democrats as well as conservative members of the GOP joined to put the present Administration in power last November. What should their attitude — the attitude of all conservatives — be towards the Eisenhower Administration?

Obviously, they must primarily be concerned with sin — no matter which occupant of the White House commits sin. They are constrained to oppose the violation of economic and political principles they all hold high. They must look upon parties and politicians only as means to ends. They must take up arms against the errors of socialism, in whatever shape these may appear. Labels are superficial, principles are fundamental.

For that reason we are disturbed by the accumulating evidence, during the early days of the Eisenhower regime, of a tendency to continue what we found fault with in the Roosevelt-Truman era. Some of the presidential appointments are rather ominous, not merely because of the inadequacies of the appointees but because of some of the jobs to which they were appointed. Thus, the job assigned to Mr. Stassen was not a receivership of the Mutual Security Administration — there was not even a suggestion that the thing is really bankrupt — and the inference is that he is to manage it as a going concern. Furthermore, President Eisenhower's State of the Union message treated the present Social Security system not as the fraud which it is, but as a good which should be expanded. In

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

short, despite a number of excellent policies which the President proposed, he muddied the picture with unsound ones.

Perhaps it is still too early to come to conclusions. It took twenty years to build the New Deal empire, and our adjustment to it may necessitate a long and gradual liquidation; emancipation did not come easy to the slaves. It may take more than four years to re-educate the American people to freedom, and perhaps the new regime plans to give us the education in gradually increasing doses. We hope so. But, a beginning should be made.

AN AUSPICIOUS beginning would be the abolition, by the simple process of non-extension, of the special powers granted the Presidency during the war. When the treaty of peace with Japan was concluded, on April 28, 1952, about one hundred of these emergency laws were allowed to terminate, but at the request of Mr. Truman, who had conveniently paved the way by declaring a new "emergency" during the previous December, 152 of these laws were kept in force. They expire on June 30 of this year, and rumor has it that President Eisenhower, acting under advice, will ask Congress for a further extension and, of course, for a suitable appropriation of funds.

Lumping the 152 statutes, their substance is to hand the President a blank check for spending purposes. Whatever wartime need they served, in peacetime they have done little more than to spawn bureaus and entrench bureaucrats. They empower him, without further reference to Congress, except for funds which the laws oblige it to provide, to acquire and build houses, to continue conscription, to build army posts and extend military facilities deemed necessary by the Secretary of War, to seize railroads and steamships, to control radio stations, to call out the state militia — to do a host of things that he could not do under the Constitution, or without special legislation, in peacetime.

The war which occasioned these special powers lasted five years, but we find them still on the books eight years later. Why? A few of these laws cannot in justice be abolished out-of-hand, for they provide for benefits for boys whose lives were upset by the war. These could be examined by the current Congress and re-enacted on their merits. But the majority of the 152 laws simply continue the President's privilege of spending the taxpayer's money for the perpetuation of war-built administrations. Isn't the war over?

Mr. Truman based his request for the continuation of his powers on the Korean affair, and it is presumed that if the rumored request is made by the new Administration the same reason will be offered. In that case, Congress might well ask the untouchable question: are we at war and, if so, with whom? That would clear the air of the unconstitutional foulness left by the ousted regime. There is nothing more important for the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress to do than to restore the Constitutional processes that were intended to prevent the President from assuming more power than is good for us, and, incidentally, to give back to Congress the place it is supposed to have in our scheme of government. If we are at war, let us so say as the Constitution provides; let us stop making war in the Truman-Acheson way. Or the UN way.

CREDENCE CAN BE given the reported rumor, for the simple reason that the President would thus be following the historic pattern of all governments, a pattern which is so constant and invariable that it can be put down as a political principle: the State never gives up power of its own will. Inherent in government is the urge to hold on to all the authority it has and to seek for more. And this is just as true of governments which are presumably delimited by constitutions, or those that are republican in structure, as it is true of unrestrained personal governments. Some American Presidents, like the last two, deliberately went out of their way to augment their authority (always, of course, in the "public interest"), but every president since Washington left the White House with more prerogatives than he found on his inauguration. Even Jefferson, who was philosophically opposed to centralization, found occasion to assume powers not granted to him, even though his conscience bothered him into a rationalization.

War, or the threat of it, not only opens wide the door of power, but actually impels us to thrust power upon the Executive. When the enemy is at the city gates, fear for the safety of the community induces the citizens to endow their captain with all that is in his opinion needed for its protection; their property and their lives are put at his disposal, and of course their hard-won freedom is dumped into the general grant.

War over, the importance of the captain suffers a let-down, which he desperately tries to prevent by inventing new "emergencies"; it is not difficult for him to convince himself of their existence. The war powers acquired by the captain — which in our case is the Executive branch of government — are never fully relinquished. Some that cause great popular irritation may be given up, like the suspension of habeas corpus, but only in response to a vigorous demand. But those that can be exercised without interfering with the lives of the citizens — except in the imperceptible way of taxation — are allowed to remain in force. The inertia of the people, who have enough to do with getting on in the world, and are not concerned with long-term effects, facilitates the process of power-accumulation; in fact, after they have made adjustment to life without rights they actually resent any effort to restore them.

Truman followed the historic pattern when he asked for a continuation of his war powers. Ike showed a most encouraging disposition when he broke with this tradition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last week and decided that wage and price controls should die. Nevertheless, the new President is only human and he may fail to deal with war powers in the same way — unless the people demand their liquidation.

BEFORE THE INVENTION of representative government, the only way for the people to unburden themselves of political interference in their lives was by revolution. Since revolution is attended with much cost and unpleasantness, somewhere along the line of history somebody thought up the idea of putting up this barrier to the natural and insatiable power-hunger of the chief or monarch. The ultimate refinement of this idea of restraint is the system of "checks and balances" embodied in our Constitution. In this scheme, the Founding Fathers not only admitted the necessity of holding the Executive in line, but also recognized the possibility of Congress getting out of hand, and put a Judicial branch over both of them.

Despite occasional lapses in the performance of its duty as watchdog of the people's interests, Congress has on the whole rendered a creditable job. So much so, that president after president has taken occasion to denounce and discredit it, and has gone to the people for their support of grants of power denied him by Congress; even as kings of old, in their struggles with equally ambitious lesser chieftains, would seek alliances with the chieftains' subjects.

Twenty years ago came a president who was fortuitously supplied with an emergency that in some respects was more desperate than war: The Depression. Assuming the role of public savior, he demanded powers comparable to those of an absolute monarch, and a bewildered Congress supinely granted him all he asked for. Following the historic pattern, Mr. Roosevelt not only entrenched himself behind these powers, but when Congress eventually screwed up enough courage to deny him more, he went to great lengths to undermine its prestige. By propaganda, paid for by the public — to say nothing of patronage bribery — he just about liquidated public faith in the Legislative branch of our government. War helped him in this purpose. His successor likewise struggled to remove Congress from the path to presidential self-sufficiency.

Congress needs nothing more than to re-establish itself in the public esteem, and the interests of the people would be in better case if it proceeded to do so at once. If we need a Congress at all, we need it to protect us against the power-avarice of the Executive; that is its proper and constitutional function. If it is derelict in its duty, what is left for us? Revolution?

A propitious step toward the re-establishment of Congress would be its refusal to extend the war powers.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume X, No. 6 Wednesday, February 11, 1953 Washington, D. C.

FEB 19 '53

Time for Repeal: Libertarians have long nourished a dream — during the oppressive days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal — of a happy time when a legislative session would be entirely devoted, not to passing laws, but to repealing laws. There's never a good law — they would wisecrack — which could not be made better if it were repealed. In fact, the word "repeal" rings well in the ears of all opponents of the all-powerful State. When the Mother of Parliaments erased the Corn Laws in 1846 (thereby creating a partial free trade system), when in 1933 America repealed Prohibition, and when a few years ago the 80th Congress did some rescinding — good was performed and the common weal bettered.

So, today we can report a new and unexpected development of this nature on Capitol Hill.

It sounds almost weirdly paradoxical to say that conservatives in Congress are actually considering whether they should give their backing to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nevertheless, it is true — with some qualifications. Most people forget that this piece of labor legislation was passed to provide controls counter-balancing controls of an earlier, pro-labor bill, the Wagner Act. The latter clamped controls on employers and gave birth to the bureaucratic monster known as the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). Since then employers have writhed from the ministrations of NLRB, and have found some, but inadequate, relief from the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now in the corridors and cloakrooms of Congress, there is serious talk of a movement to put over repeal of both the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts, to wipe the slate clean of all labor legislation. This is no idle fancy. It is gravely being examined by many who have devoted much of their Congressional careers to the study of the labor problem.

Oddly enough, at least one labor boss, Mr. John L. Lewis, has for many years entertained the same notion. The Wagner Act never was of much help to his United Mine Workers union; and his savage sentiments about Taft-Hartley are well known. In the campaign of 1948, Lewis urged Dewey to stand for this total elimination of both Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts. Dewey — as was his wont that year — said nothing.

But John L. this year has had nothing to do with the thesis that both statutes should go. It is a purely conservative development. Some conservatives say: "Let's repeal both — and start all over again." But others amend this, as follows: "Let's clean the decks, and let them stay clean."

Conant: The confirmation of the Harvard President to hold the job of High Commissioner in Germany slipped through the Senate last Friday — in controversial circumstances which have prompted some to call it "Black Friday". Only about 10 Senators of the 96 were present, and two of them — Case of South Dakota and Dworshak of Idaho — protested the appointment in extensive speeches.

Dworshak revealed an interesting admission by Conant to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations. The educator told the Committee that Secretary Dean Acheson some eighteen months ago asked him to become Ambassador to Germany and he refused; he refused, he said, not because he had any objection to the Acheson policies, but because he expected that there would be a change in the Administration in 1952.

Senator Case emphasized the shortcomings of a man who had urged what was essentially the Morgenthau Plan for reduction of German industry in 1944; and effectively rebutted the attempts of Conant and two of his senatorial friends to free him from this stigma. (The Case speech was especially persuasive. For the full text, see the *Congressional Record*, February 6, pp. 963-7.)

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although it was Friday night (when many are customarily absent) and few were left on the floor of the Senate, the appointment went to a vote — a voice vote which some present thought was by no means unanimous. Taft had left the Senate before the debate on the appointment, and Knowland was acting leader. Many Senators have told us that they had been under the impression — due to announcements in the newspapers to that effect — that the voting on the appointment would go over until the following week, if not to the second week after.

Two Senators told us that they expected at least 30 would vote against it last week; and if the vote had been held over for ten days, the growing criticism of the appointment throughout the country might have caused many more to vote against it.

The whole affair leaves a bad taste. Conant is one of the "old guard", one of the followers of Democratic Administration policy. Voters had reason to expect that the new Administration — in view of the upsurge of popular sentiment against the *ancien regime* — would really express a change, in appointments as well as in acts of policy.

Coudert Amendment: The amendment to reform the electoral college, proposed by Congressman Coudert, if it were in force today, would in all probability have stifled one of the more obscene spectacles of the current scene. We refer to the vicious attempt to discredit the excellent immigration law, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, which passed Congress last session and has just recently gone into effect.

A combination of waterfront gangsters, Communists and left-wing Jewish organizations have been making the welkin ring, in an effort to smear Senator McCarran and Congressman Walter for enacting this bill to keep out Communists and criminals and to preserve the long established ethnic pattern of the U.S. The bill was passed by an overwhelming majority of Senators and Congressmen, with a stubborn minority from the big city states in opposition to it. General Eisenhower's all too impressionable advisers have obviously been affected by the din.

If the Coudert amendment were in effect, the White House would today have no qualms. The Coudert amendment requires that each presidential elector be chosen from a congressional district, with two electors in each state at-large (like Senators) in a pattern corresponding to that of Congress. Thus, the Executive would be chosen by the same people (in each Congressional district) who elect the Congress. Congress and the Executive would thereby be harmonized from the very beginning of an Administration.

If the Coudert amendment were in effect today, the Eisenhower Headquarters would not now be worried over the caterwauling of the special groups in few large Eastern urban centers. They would remain happily impervious to the blackmailing released by the alliance of Communism and corruption. They would possess confidence that a vast majority of the people of the country — fairly represented in the Senate and House — were staunchly behind the Chief Executive. Thus fortified, Eisenhower's advisers would see no necessity to appease the opposition. For, by the Coudert admendment, the political power of the great urban centers would be reduced to its proper proportion in the national scene. And the press and radio, instead of playing up the demonstration as at present, would accord it only the proportionate small importance it deserves.

Diplomatic Follies: As the crisis in the Near East (with the Soviets courting Arabs with anti-Zionism) mounts rapidly, Loy Henderson, old-line diplomat, is slated to be sent to Egypt as U.S. Ambassador. Henderson drew down upon himself the ire of Zionists four years ago by seeking a fair deal for the Arabs; he will be welcomed in Cairo. But, two barriers might intervene: (1) Henderson is presently Ambassador to Iran, and there is much work to perform in that troubled country before he can leave for Egypt; and (2) in Washington, "they" say that at least three "fat cats" of the GOP (who aren't diplomats) are lobbying for the job.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recently, as diplomats were eagerly speculating on what Ike would say in his first address to Congress, a resounding row in diplomatic row intervened and diverted attention to what might be termed a "trade" matter for the striped-pants brethren. The Philippine Ambassador literally "threw" a reception for the incoming Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. What cheek! — said many diplomats. For protocol required that Mr. Morgenstierne, Ambassador for Norway, as dean of the diplomatic corps, had precedence, in giving the first party for Mr. Dulles. The Norwegian's cup was over-flowing; for it is reported that, in the crush at the Inaugural Ball, he was roughly handled by a District of Columbia flatfoot.

Will Mr. George McGhee remain as Ambassador of Turkey? This wealthy diplomat reportedly guessed wrong on the election last fall, preferred Stevenson, and ever since the election has been trying desperately to mend his fences with the new Administration. McGhee's father-in-law is E. L. de Golyer, Texas oil millionaire. The latter reportedly gave only $2,500 to the Republicans in Texas — which is a piddling sum compared with what other oil barons contributed. How much did he give Stevenson? Texas stands high in Administration favor now. McGhee's in trouble.

Names! Names! Names! You know at least two people — maybe twenty — who ought to be reading HUMAN EVENTS. Please send us their names and addresses, so that we can tell them about this publication.

Education Front: Last week, under the heading "Worried Educators", we mentioned in this column a meeting held in Denver by the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. This item induced Mrs. Lucille C. Crain, editor of *The Educational Reviewer*, to send us a detailed account of the character and purpose of this organization. The account is at variance with newspaper stories, which gave the impression that the organization is "grass roots" in origin, absolutely "public spirited" in its motivation.

In the first place, the account reveals that the NCCPS is not financed by contributions from the public as intimated; it is supported by grants from the New York Community Trust and the Sloan, Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. Beardsley Ruml, chairman of its finance committee, is associated with the last two Foundations. Dr. James B. Conant, presently High Commissioner to Germany, and an outspoken critic of private schools, was one of the founders of the NCCPS; he is not without influence on the boards of these wealthy supporters of left-wing thought.

Incidentally, Dr. Conant is chairman of the Educational Policies Committee of the National Education Association. It is not surprising that the NCCPS is strong for all the things for which the NEA lobbies: more federal aid to education (with nationalization of the public schools as its ultimate aim); more local taxes for schools; more support for "progressive" education.

Apart from the usual "window-dressing" names of prominent businessmen (the "innocents"), the roster of the NCCPS board includes advocates of socialistic measures. Some are listed in the membership of organizations officially termed "subversive"; more are identified with collectivistic movements like the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action).

Hence, when you get a circular asking you to join up, "as a person interested in the welfare of our public schools", you can be sure that you are being invited to lend support to a movement intent on turning our schools into an instrument for the advancement of socialism.

Radio Front: A number of gallant radio commentators, barred from networks, are waging battles in their local areas to bring the facts of the political picture to their listeners. We list several of these, whose current broadcasts deserve wider notice:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) In the Milwaukee-Chicago area, Mr. Frank Kirkpatrick is heard over WGN (Chicago) Sundays, 1-1:30 p.m. We have read a transcript of his remarkably frank broadcast of January 4, 1953. In it Kirkpatrick attacked world government and traced the trail of "strange characters" of global government and left-wing persuasion through the highways and by-ways of the new Administration.

(2) A broadcast interview staged on WHBC, Canton, on December 28, 1952, has achieved wide distribution. It was sponsored by the American Legion and the Keep America Free Council (P.O. Box 281, Canton, Ohio — for copies). The participants (Mr. Glenn Powell and Charles O'Hara) exposed the "one worldism" of an organization called the World Affairs Councils, which they termed "the follow-up of the ignominious Institute of Pacific Relations". O'Hara said: "Thousands of people have joined the World Affairs Councils. Many highly reputable businessmen and top public figures have allowed their names to be used as trustees or officers."

(3) Willis J. Ballinger commentator on the Capital scene (whom we have mentioned in this column previously), is still "punching" on WPIK, Alexandria, Va., Mon., Wed., Fri., 5:15 p.m. His recent broadcasts on the crime situation and its links with the left-wing have proved illuminating to listeners. Ballinger also provides news on the progress of "revisionism" of the propaganda myths of the last war.

West Coast News: The findings of the McCarran Committee hearings on the famous Institute of Pacific Relations occupy many large volumes and few will take the time to read them. But there is one excellent tabloid presentation of the highlights of these hearings which have made history, written by Anthony T. Bouscaren, Professor of Political Science at the University of San Francisco. His summation has been published in *The Commonwealth*, weekly journal of the Commonwealth Club of California (Hotel St. Francis, San Francisco 1, Calif.). The bulky testimony and reports have been neatly and readably compressed into a series of pithy, one-sentence paragraphs.

The Board of Education of Los Angeles has banned the use of the controversial UNESCO program in its schools, after a strong campaign waged by pro-American elements in that area. One able and effective fighter against the propaganda of the United Nations on the West Coast is Mary Lamar Knight, who edits an interesting monthly leaflet, *Facts in Education* (P.O. Box 2056 D, Pasadena, Calif.) in which developments in the UNESCO problem, the famous Pasadena school controversy and the perennial loyalty oath conflict are reported. Miss Knight served for many years abroad as a correspondent for the United Press and is author of *Red Blight*, the story of the debacle of our policy in the Far East (published by Lorrin L. Morrison, Los Angeles, Calif.).

Taft and Byrd: On February 23, Senator Taft will receive an award, presented by the American Good Government Society, for the Ohioan's contributions to constitutional government — among these public services, his stand against the *ex post facto* nature of the Nuremberg trials. At the same function, Senator Harry Byrd will be similarly honored, for his zeal in trying to maintain national solvency.

The awards will be given at a George Washington birthday dinner in the Hotel Statler in the nation's Capital. Former Senator E. R. Burke of Nebraska will preside, with Dr. Colgate Darden, President of the University of Virginia, making the address of the evening. Byrd and Taft will also speak. The dinner is public and orders for tickets ($15 a plate) are being taken at the office of the American Good Government Society, 1624 Eye Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

The occasion is designed not only to honor the Father of our country, and two great Senators, but also to symbolize the Congressional coalition of northern and southern conservatives of both parties, of which Taft and Byrd are the leaders.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED